

jp

ADDRESS

by

PRESIDENT GAMAL ABDEL NASSER

at the great popular rally
held by the Arab Socialist Union
in celebration of the anniversary of Unity Day

Cairo, February 22, 1966

UAR 7330

Abd
SW



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

ADDRESS

by

PRESIDENT GAMAL ABDEL NASSER

at the great popular rally
held by the Arab Socialist Union
in celebration of the anniversary of Unity Day

Cairo, February 22, 1966

Fellow-countrymen,

In the name of the people of the United Arab Republic, I thank the leader of the Iraqi delegation which is taking part with us in the celebrations of Unity Day and I ask him to carry the greetings of the people of the United Arab Republic to the struggling people of Iraq and their heroic leader, President Abdel Salam Aref.

The meeting between Cairo and Baghdad against the plots of imperialism and reaction — this meeting is a base of strength for the Arab struggle as we proceed on the road of unity. We are proceeding along the path of unity which is the hope of the entire Arab nation and this unity necessitates the strong cooperation of all the nationalist forces in order to stand up to imperialism and reaction which are plotting against the Arab homeland.

Brothers,

We celebrate to-day the anniversary of the unity, that great day of 1958 in which the Arab nation was able to realise, by its free will, the unity and to shape the future, for the first time in this modern era. Formerly, it was imperialism which laid down the frontiers and the barriers ; but this is the day which the long struggle of the Arabs look up to with pride, because the masses who achieved their independence, who realised their liberty, and who rid themselves of imperialism, were those who created the unity, on the 22nd of February, 1958.

The people who raised high the slogan of Arab nationalism, protected Arab nationalism and consolidated Arab nationalism, the people who gave Arab nationalism its strength; the struggling, fighting people look up to this day with hope and pride. Unity has always been a hope — it was never an easy task, nor a light one. Imperialism always stood against unity and against Arab nationalism. Imperialism always stood against the idea of liberation — it stood against every attempt to overcome exploitation.

Since its aim was to divide and sow dissension among us, imperialism had been keen to maintain our countries within its spheres of influence.

It was not only the unity that imperialism stood against ; imperialism was also against the unity of our word and the unity of aim ; in other words, imperialism was against any act of cooperation or collaboration.

The establishment of the unity in 1958 was the expression of the victory of the Arab masses over the will of imperialism which concentrated on dividing the Arab world and separating it. Israel, too, which imperialism had established in the heart of the Arab nation, has always stood against the call for Arab nationalism, and against the call for unity, as well as against the unity of word. Israel, aided by imperialism, has always tried to sow the seeds of dissension, conflict, and discord, in the Arab world. This, however, never stopped the Arab masses from marching along the path of Arab nationalism and the path of Arab unity ; it never stopped them from developing themselves and building themselves

up so that they could liberate Palestine and get rid of the Zionist imperialism in spite of the weapons and arms which Israel obtained in 1948, and which she obtained after 1948, and in spite of the fact that the West would not supply us with any weapons or arms unless we agreed to take part in its pacts and enter within its spheres of influence. Finally in 1955 we succeeded in breaking the arms monopoly and getting weapons from the Eastern bloc.

The West continued to arm Israel so that it becomes on parity with the forces of all the Arab States together; there were supplies in the form of gifts and others which were secret, the last of which was the offer of American arms to Israel as an expression of encouragement to Israel, and to its consolidation, and which was an expression of a policy hostile to the Arab nation, the Arab people and the Arab masses.

Things did not stop at this, but Israel was also able to obtain a nuclear reactor, and the leaders of Israel are intimating that they are on their way to produce atomic weapons.

Of course the production of atomic weapons in Israel constitutes a menace to the entire Arab nation. Israel cannot do this by itself but it can do it if the West extends to it its aid and its experts. When we feel that Israel is oriented towards producing atomic arms, we, the Arab people who liberated ourselves from imperialism, who have suffered martyrdom, who have undergone sacrifices for our brethren, and whose sons have offered themselves victims for the obtention of liberty ; the Arab

people who fought to achieve independence ; we do not find a way in front of us but a protective war. By that we can protect the Arab peoples against Zionist conspiracies and hostility, and against the conspiracies and aggression of imperialism.

Israel stood against Arab nationalism, because Israel feels that unity and the success of the call of Arab nationalism mean its destruction. It also feels that division delays the day on which the Palestine people will restore their land and rights. It feels that division enables it to find from among the rulers of the Arab nation one who is ready to stab in the back, who conspires in collaboration with imperialism to deal a blow to the Arab revolutionary action for the liberation of Palestine. Israel knows quite well who is ready in the Arab nation to play this role. Israel also discerns that Arab unity means its destruction and the elimination of the Zionist pacts. Arab unity means the destruction of Israel, the wiping out of the Zionist dreams for expansion and the elimination of the imperialist aspirations for the separation of the Arab East from the Arab West.

The enemies of unity were not only imperialism and Israel but also the reactionary powers allied with imperialism against Arab nationalism and against unity. All the anti-progressive powers are against unity. Why? Because unity always provided a social content for the eradication of exploitation, the elimination of the alliance of feudalism with capitalism, the establishment of sufficiency and justice, the setting up of a society where class differences are wiped out. Thus, in 1961, all these powers conspired against the unity which was set up

in 1958 between Egypt and Syria. Imperialism conspired with Zionism and reaction for the separation of this unity and thus the setback took place in September 1961. But did this affect the faith of the Arab peoples in unity ? Never. This did not affect the faith of the Arab peoples in unity, because unity to the Arab peoples means social justice, progress, freedom and socialism.

The Syrian people, who kept up the unity for three years, felt that they had progressed in that time. What occurred in Syria had never before taken place in all the fields. Everywhere they felt military power surrounding Israel from the north to the south, from the Arab people, the struggling Arab force and the struggling Arab masses in every Arab country. During the unity they felt that the Arab nation felt powerful, it had faith and confidence. The secession occurred in 1961, and we here in Egypt proceeded on our path bearing the name of the U.A.R. and calling for the struggle for liberty, socialism and unity, and working towards the consolidation of Arab nationalism and towards the struggle against imperialism, building our self-power and developing and constructing our country.

Here we were aware that this power was one of the main foundations of the unity, and that social justice and socialism are sound foundations for the unity, and that power would enable us to confront Israel and would enable us to face imperialism. The Arab peoples felt sad but they did not despair, instead they proceeded along the path of unity, along the path of Arab nationalism, along the path of hope.

After this setback, the revolution broke out in Yemen in 1962, and the imperialist and reactionary forces opposed it. But the unity of the Arab struggle called on us to stand by the Yemen against imperialism and reaction, which after the secession endeavoured to consolidate this success and to take new positions in the Arab world.

When we proceeded to Yemen, we felt that we were fulfilling a duty incumbent on us, a duty imposed on us by the principles we advocated, namely the unity of the Arab struggle.

In 1956, when the aggression of 1956 was launched, the Arab masses, by their awareness, and of their own accord felt that the unity of the Arab struggle laid on them the obligation to stand with all their might by the side of Egypt. In 1956, when we were exposed to the tripartite aggression, the oil pipelines were blown up in Syria in retaliation against imperialism and the aggressors. The people of Syria, of Iraq, in fact all the Arab peoples, the Arab masses in every Arab nation came forward with a profound belief in the unity of the Arab struggle.

Naturally, reaction did not come forward, but incited imperialism against us. Nuri El-Said incited Eden to attack Egypt. The reactionists rejoiced on the assumption that Egypt would not be able to face Britain, France and Israel; that the Egyptian Revolution was over. But the people of Egypt fought and struggled, and the Arab masses in every Arab country came forth in every place, threatening imperialism, its inter-

ests and its influence. All the Arab forces of the world stood by our side, the aggression was defeated and repelled, and the Revolution subsisted.

When we proceeded to Yemen, we experienced the same feeling as our brethren in 1956, about the unity of the Arab struggle and the cause of the Arab masses.

Our forces fought honourably in Yemen against the conspiracies of reaction and imperialism. Our Armed Forces fought with honour and faced the intrigues of reaction and imperialism; and so the revolution survived; the revolution which moved Yemen from the Middle Ages to the 20th century.

In our campaign in the Yemen, we sacrificed the most precious thing we have, we sacrificed our souls as well as the souls of our sons. Yet I am quite certain that the unity of Arab awareness impels the Arab peoples, everywhere and in every era, ever forward as it did in 1956 in order to sacrifice their souls for the Egyptian Revolution.

In 1956 many people gave their lives for the Egyptian Revolution, this Revolution which the Arab peoples looked forward to since it was their hope towards their complete liberation from imperialism. The Egyptian Revolution was equally the people's hope towards Arab unity as well as the liberation from partition and artificial barriers; yet it was our duty which we had to fulfil.

Brethren,

Now, while celebrating Unity Day, I seize this opportunity and salute our heroic men in Yemen; these

men who, with honour, accomplished their duty; and who fulfilled their responsibility before the Arab peoples and before the Arab nation and before the unity of the Arab struggle.

Last summer, we had talks with Saudi Arabia for the settlement of the problem of the Yemen. We all know that Saudi Arabia used to support the royalists and provide them with arms and funds; Saudi Arabia used to allow the royalists to stay on its territory in the two zones of Gizan and Nagran. Those royalists exploited these two zones as arms-stores and ammunition-stores. They used to resort to these zones when threatened by the Arab forces.

The Arab talks with the Saudi Kingdom in Jeddah started. The aim of these talks was to preserve the spirit of the unity of work which appeared in the Summit Conference, and we reached an agreement, and we declared that we would keep the Jeddah agreement. The Jeddah agreement is very clear; put simply, it says that the Yemeni people are to decide on their destiny for themselves, they have their right to self-determination; the agreement also stipulates that both Yemeni sides should meet on November 23 to form a transitional government. It also stipulates that we should withdraw our troops.

In an interview given by King Feisal yesterday, he said that Cairo has to withdraw its troops, and he asks why it has not done so. What occurred is that the Conference which met on November 23 could not agree and ended without forming a Yemeni government which

can hold the plebiscite. I think that it is unlikely that I went to Saudi Arabia last August just to agree with them on withdrawing the Egyptian troops from Yemen. If we were only concerned with the withdrawal of the Egyptian troops from Yemen, I could have decided upon that in Cairo without having to go to Saudi Arabia. The talks which took place in Saudi Arabia aimed at finding a solution to the Yemeni problem and giving the Yemeni people the right to determine their future; the agreement also stipulated the withdrawal of our troops. Consequently, the withdrawal of the troops depends on settling the Yemeni problem and forming the government which would hold the plebiscite. If this government cannot be formed then our troops in Yemen will not be withdrawn, they will not withdraw till the Yemeni Revolution is capable of defending itself against the plots of imperialism, and the plots of reaction.

In King Feisal's interview yesterday, he said that Cairo has to withdraw its troops, and he completely ignored the settling of the Yemeni problem which is the main issue which we had talked about when we went to Jeddah. If anyone thinks that we have had enough, or that we are tired, they should realise that we are a struggling people, a patient people. I say that our troops will remain in Yemen if the government aiming at self-determination is not formed.

Yesterday King Feisal also said that Cairo has not replied with regard to the interpretation of the article which was the cause of discord in the Jeddah Agreement. I repeat that this talk is not realistic. We have

maintained our contacts with them, and the last answer we gave was on January 11, when we told them our point of view with regard to the whole subject. A journalist asked King Feisal what he thought about Egypt and withdrawing her troops from Yemen, and Feisal replied that he could offer no explanation but that he knew that Cairo had internal problems resulting from certain circumstances.

The journalist went on to question King Feisal on the possibility of further fighting in Yemen and he replied : « We do not want any fighting and I believe that the President has internal problems which would prevent him from fighting. »

What are these problems ? Of course we have preoccupations and problems. He once says preoccupations and another time he says problems, in an attempt at slander at our internal situation. We have the preoccupations of converting the society from a feudalist and capitalist society into a socialist society in which sufficiency and justice prevail. We have the preoccupations of development and construction. What has been achieved in these 14 years was not to be achieved in 50 years. The budget rose from L.E. 200 million to L.E. 1100 million, the national income rose from L.E. 800 million to L.E. 1800 million, production rose from L.E. 1800 million to L.E. 3500 million. We have schools for all the people, we have equal opportunities, we have social justice for all the sons of the nation and equal opportunities for all the sons of the nation. We do not have a minority which obtains everything for itself and a majority which takes almost nothing. We raise pro-

duction, increase the national income and provide every person in our country with honourable work; the resources of the country are for all its sons; we liberate the individual from economic and social exploitation after having destroyed the alliance of feudalism and capitalism.

These are the preoccupations existing in our country. But if he means the question of the stooge Moslem Brotherhood, then this is another question.

When I went to Jeddah in August and before talking with King Feisal, I told him that I would like to give him an idea about the situation in our country lest the Moslem Brotherhood should have made him understand that they could change anything or take any action; I knew that they had taken money from him and I knew that he prolonged the talks on the basis or assumption that the Moslem Brotherhood might change the situation in a month or two or three, and I should like to assure him that all the Brothers are quiet now and that there isn't a noise out of even one of them. I also told him that Saudi Arabia gave money to Said Ramadan and that Zaghlul Abdel Rahman said in his confessions when he came here and gave himself up that L.E. 250 thousand were paid to Said Ramadan and the Abu El Fath brothers abroad to work against our regime.

If he means the hired Ikhwan (the outlawed Moslem Brothers) then he knows from where their conspiracies were financed. He knows they were paid by the Baghdad Pact, by Saudi Arabia and by Arab reactionaries. The

people concerned with the affairs of the Brothers abroad sold themselves to anyone from whom they could take money — to every enemy of Egypt. They became true hirelings of the reactionaries and imperialism.

The Brothers were never an issue : they were round-ed up in ten minutes. Ours is an open and free country. We have freedom, we have criticism, we have self-criticism. Ours is not a closed reactionary country where a person can be executed without anybody knowing about it. When we arrest anyone we announce it and whoever stands trial is tried openly and the proceedings are published by the press. Ours is an open society for all the world's press to write about.

We are not, therefore, daunted by such talk. Our press criticises, everybody criticises, because we must have criticism. So we are not concerned by anyone interpreting such talk as being due to our pre-occupa-tions at home. In 1956 the British thought we had domestic preoccupations, and when their planes began to bomb us the British Embassy Counsellor was enquiring where the demonstrations were. There were none, and the Counsellor waited, disappointed, for demonstra-tions that were never to take place.

Instead, the people rushed out into the streets shouting their resolve to fight : 'We will fight, we will fight.' These are the people of Egypt and that is their nature and character. Eden, who counted on demon-strations where is he now ? He is gone — gone with the fiasco of the aggression of Suez.

We can stay in the Yemen one year, two, three,

four or five years. we can make sacrifices, We can stand it, for we believe in the Arab masses, the Arab revolution and the unity of Arab struggle.

One of the results of the Yemeni revolution is that Britain had no choice but to give independence to Aden and the Occupied South.

The solidarity and unity of struggle have transferred the armed struggle to the Occupied South. The Arab people in the Occupied South struggle for freedom and independence, and they could not have found assistance had it not been for the presence of the UAR forces in the Yemen. Britain will have no choice but to give independence to the Arab people in the South.

An announcement was made today that Britain had decided to give independence in 1968. We will stay there till after 1968.

Brethren; I told you last year that we were passing through one of the most difficult years of the Arab struggle, one of the most serious years of the Arab struggle.

When I made this statement on last year's Unity Day, I felt there were reactionary and imperialist move-ments in the Arab world; I felt the forces of reaction in the Arab world were combining with imperialism to destroy the idea of Arab nationalism and progressive thoughts in order to defend themselves against socialism.

The forces of reaction are the exploiting forces that get hold of the people's money and give them little in

return. I felt that the forces of reaction and imperialism looked rather disparagingly at the Arab struggle and the unity of the Arab struggle.

Rumours began to circulate last year that the forces of reaction had managed to alter their positions and they had turned to the offensive and that the pro-unity revolutionary systems, which advocated Arab nationalism, were on the defensive.

Of course, they had this feeling from September 28, the day of the secession of Syria from Egypt. They afterwards strengthened this feeling and felt they could destroy all progressive forces in the Arab world. They convinced themselves that the unity of the Arab struggle was something gone, disintegrated. The unity of the Arab struggle, however, is something that is not ended nor has it disintegrated.

Such an attitude reminds me of the attitude we faced in 1954 and 1955. What reminded me of this attitude was what we are hearing today in the Arab world about pacts and groupings. It is important to recall previous events in order to give the Arab masses faith in their capability, and to make a lesson of Nuri El-Said to Arab reactionaries.

In 1955, the Turkish Premier visited Iraq and had talks with Nuri El-Said. The talks ended with a joint communiqué. The communiqué said that talks were held between the two sides with regard to the importance of creating cooperation in a bid to maintain security and stability in the Middle East area. The Iraqi and the Turkish governments decided to conclude an agree-

ment stipulating the creation and the expansion of the said cooperation as soon as possible.

The agreement would contain a pledge to cooperate in repelling any aggression against them whether such aggression came from inside or outside the area. The communiqué then explained the goals of the agreement and said it served the United Nations Charter with regard to the realisation of stability in the area, and the protection of peace in the area.

The communiqué ended by urging other countries to join the agreement. They did not mention however that this was the Baghdad Pact. Rather they said it was an Iraqi-Turkish agreement. In those days, the attempts made by Western countries — especially Britain — were concentrated on having the Middle East area join its pacts in order to continue to be within its zone of influence.

Before the Revolution, in 1951, the Middle East defensive pact appeared. The U.S., Britain, France and Turkey submitted proposals for defending the Middle East to the Arab countries and Israel. After submitting these proposals to the Arab countries and Israel simultaneously, the defensive pact was unanimously rejected by the Arab countries and the pact failed before it was born.

In 1953, the US Secretary of State John Foster Dulles visited us and we told him we did not approve of pacts. He was obsessed by the idea of pacts in the Middle East in order to link them with NATO. He left, and at the end of 1953 he said he had toured the

Arab territory and found that there was readiness for collective security in the Middle East, but that this system could not be imposed from outside but could grow from within.

It was clear that the Turkish-Iraqi communiqué was an implementation of the Dulles doctrine; that the pact starts from within and grows gradually so that the struggling Arab masses would be deceived before the meeting of the Turkish Premier with the Iraqi Premier. We knew of the Iraqi intention, and the late Salah Salem travelled to the Arab countries and met Nuri El-Said to convince him to preserve the unity of the Arabs. We said that our policy was that the interests of the Arab nation would not be maintained unless we rejected pacts and blocs, and that we should unify Arab foreign policy in all that related to the present and future of the Arab peoples and that collective Arab security should be turned into actual facts supporting the Arab League.

Nuri El-Said promised to come to Cairo to discuss the matter. He came in August, 1954, and we opened talks with him. I concentrated on the strengthening of the Arab Collective Security Pact. I asked him what the means were of strengthening the Arab Collective Security Pact, which is an Arab joint defence pact and until then had remained mere ink on paper. Nuri El-Said tersely replied that he thought that I should summon the British and American ambassadors and tell them that we wanted to strengthen the Collective Security Pact and ask them what means there were for that and what their views on it were.

I certainly contested this idea, but I was surprised by the ease with which he spoke these words, despite his well-known political colour. He then proposed that Pakistan be allowed to join the Pact, but we rejected this on the ground that Pakistan was allied with Britain and the West. He also proposed that Turkey be admitted into the Pact, and we also turned that down because Turkey was a member of NATO.

But Nuri El-Said said : «We will ally ourselves with those who will stand by us. We will ally ourselves with the Americans and the British. No need for France, but we will form a pact with America, Britain, Iran and Pakistan, and thus widen the Collective Security Pact.»

He went on to say that it was important that we ensure that the West would arm us despite Israel. He said we must be practical because the Arab nationalism I was talking about was impractical. What were Jordan and Syria, and what were the Arabs ? he asked, saying he had no faith in these ideas we were talking about. He said he had to form a pact with America, Britain, Turkey, Iran and Pakistan. Thus Nuri El-Said disclosed in August 1954 the plan they had prepared, naming countries that would take part. Before leaving, he gave me a piece of advice for my personal future — that I should join his pact.

On February 24, 1955, the Iraqi treaty was signed; this constituted the first step in the Baghdad Pact. Pressure was then exerted on Arab countries, specially Syria, Jordan and Lebanon to join the Pact.

Pressure was also exerted on us to join the Pact. At that time, we had a mission in England negotiating for arms. They were told they would get no arms so long as Cairo was opposing the Baghdad Pact.

America blessed the pact by issuing an official statement. Britain signed a special agreement with Iraq which replaced the 1930 treaty and joined the Pact, which was called the Baghdad Pact.

They called it the Baghdad Pact to give it an Arab label, as Dulles said. They gave it an Arab name because Cairo was opposed to it.

Iran and Pakistan then joined the Pact. Plots then began to force Syria to join the Baghdad Pact, but the Syrian people held fast and all forces failed to make Syria join this Pact.

In December, 1955, General Templar went to Jordan to exert pressure upon that country to join the Pact, but the militant people of Jordan dismissed Templar.

After Templar was defeated and Jordan did not join the Baghdad Pact, the USA became an observer-member of the Pact.

What are the real facts about the Baghdad Pact ? The Baghdad Pact stipulations did not reveal its real objectives; they implied that it was a harmless, defensive, regional alliance. As a matter of fact, the Baghdad Pact was carrying out an Anglo-American plan in the Middle East.

Of course, numerous conspiracies were discovered against Jordan, against Syria and against Lebanon. These conspiracies were announced in the Baghdad trials, which were held after the Revolution of July 14, 1958.

In Eisenhower's memoirs, recently published, it was said that an aggression was decided upon in 1957 to be launched against Syria from Turkey and that they sent delegates from America to come to terms with Turkey on a plan to invade Syria. Then the situation changed and they preferred to have the invasion launched from Iraq, by Nuri El-Said.

On March 30 1955, Eden, then British Prime Minister, made a statement before the British House of Commons saying that we have reached a stage, by virtue of this agreement, in which we can lay down a system which will be the basis for organising the defence of the Middle East. In this way, he said, we have strengthened our influence and have a better say in the affairs of the Middle East. He added that he approved of any grouping which would increase the influence of his country. The objective then, was to place the Arab countries inside the spheres of influence, since Turkey, Iran and Pakistan were already members of pacts with Britain and the United States.

Anthony Nutting, who was then Secretary for Foreign Affairs, said in the British House of Commons on April 14, 1955, that our (Britain's) principal interest calls for encouraging this initiative by one of our partners in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, meaning Turkey, and by one of our ancient allies in the Arab

world, meaning Iraq. Nutting said that British policy had aimed for a long time to establish effective means of defending the Middle East and that the investment in petroleum was another important factor stressing the necessity of sufficient and effective means of defending this area. This, he said, is what we did by virtue of our new agreement with Iraq and our membership of the Turkish-Iraqi treaty which was later called the Baghdad Pact.

After the Suez war, and after the defeat of Britain in this war, the Baghdad Pact was very much affected, especially because the Pact was in agreement about the aggression as well as internationalisation of the Canal after the aggression. It was clear there was no possibility for any country other than Iraq to join the Baghdad Pact. The Arab people and Arab masses in every Arab country were mobilised against imperialistic pacts.

In 1957, the Eisenhower Doctrine appeared. Some Arab countries joined it. In the new attempt, they did not name it a pact but rather a doctrine, since the Arab people rejected pacts. We here in Egypt rejected the Eisenhower Doctrine. It was also rejected by Syria. We announced our opinion about this Doctrine in September, 1957. I said that the Eisenhower Doctrine, in essence, was a new military pact, an alternative to the plan to defend the Middle East which was rejected in 1951. I also said it was a completion of the Baghdad Pact and that it was meant to put life in the Baghdad Pact. Did the Eisenhower Doctrine go on or succeed? It did not. The Arab countries, the Arab masses and the Arab peo-

ple in every Arab country rejected the Eisenhower Doctrine.

On the day named for the meeting of the Heads of State signing the Baghdad Pact in Ankara to consider the Middle East affairs and organise intervention in it, the world woke up to news of the Revolution of July 14 in Iraq; the revolution which overthrew the monarchical system in Iraq. Thus, the Baghdad Pact fell. It no longer embraced Baghdad, and the people who had chosen Baghdad as a name for the pact had to find a new name. They called it the CENTO Pact.

Today we ask: where did Nuri El-Said go, the man who said Arab nationalism was nonsense, the man who said «Who are the Arabs and what are the Arab people?» On July 14, he was running disguised in the streets of Baghdad, and the Arab people of whom he said what he had said were running after him until they caught him.

Nuri El-Said passed away and an act in the drama of treason in the Arab nations was ended. The CENTO Pact continued the policy drawn up for it by Britain and the US to face progress in the Arab world and stand against the Arab world and stand against Arab nationalism, Arab freedom, progress and social justice for the sake of foreign interests and foreign monopolies. It concentrated on Cairo and waged propaganda and psychological campaigns.

In April, 1965, the Ministerial Council of the CENTO Pact held a meeting to consider the UAR policy in the territory.

The discussion of what they called Middle East problems by the Council revealed that its meetings were turned into a campaign against the United Arab Republic.

Abbas Aram, the Iranian Foreign Minister, told the Council that some Arab countries, who are maintaining contacts with the Iranian Government, had complained they were being exposed to pressure from the United Arab Republic and Gamal Abdel Nasser to resist the plans of the West in the area.

The Iranian Minister said his Government did not believe in the policy of non-alignment or recognise its usefulness and that Egypt, by adopting this policy, was helping communism in an indirect manner. The Foreign Minister of Iran then submitted the demand of the Shah's Government which was for unified action by the major Western powers and their allies against the United Arab Republic and its policy in the Arab area.

The United Press news agency reported that the Iranian Foreign Minister said that the attitude of the United Arab Republic was considered a menace to Iran, comparable in seriousness to any other menace in the world. After making his allegation, the Minister relied on CENTO to protect him from the Egyptian danger threatening the Shah's throne.

This is CENTO and this is the talk which goes on inside the organisation. A few days later, the hallucination of the Shah of Iran, of the words said at the Alabaster Hall in Teheran, during the meetings of CENTO, were proved when a machine-gun, carried by an Iranian, not an Egyptian, soldier was fired.

Then it turned out that the menace to the Shah's throne was not posed by the United Arab Republic or the people of the United Arab Republic but by the Iranian people, who are suffering injustice and suppression and whose wealth is being seized. This is another link in the series of plots before and after the Baghdad Pact.

When CENTO met in April 1965, details learned about the talks of the American and the British Foreign Ministers revealed the new reactionary imperialist ambitions to restore the areas imperialism had lost after it had been expelled by the comprehensive Arab revolution, especially in Iraq. The reactionary imperialist plot against Iraq aimed at alienating Baghdad from Cairo.

The imperialist reactionary alliance aimed at spreading the idea of Islamic unity to counter Arab unity. It agreed that the Islamic countries of the Baghdad Pact should work for Islamic unity and contact Arab States in order that the idea of Islamic unity should counter Arab unity.

In 1957, King Saud visited America. On his way back he visited Egypt. He said that he had talked with Eisenhower who advised him to go ahead with the setting-up of the Islamic Pact. At that time he asked us to form an Islamic Pact with him. In his memoirs, Eisenhower said American policy in 1957 was to use King Saud to counter Arab unity and oppose the call for Arab nationalism. This is the history of continuous struggle.

In 1960, the Shah of Iran announced Iran's recognition of Israel. Of course, we broke off diplomatic rela-

tions with Iran. Some people may ask why we broke off diplomatic relations with Iran and not with other countries.

There are other countries in the world which have recognised Israel and yet we maintain political and diplomatic relations with them. But we broke off diplomatic relations with Iran in particular because it always posed a threat of trading with religion. Iran misleads in the name of Islam. Iran recognised Israel in 1950 and the Mossadeq government withdrew its recognition in 1951. The Israeli Consulate in Teheran was closed. But after the return of the Shah's reactionary rule in 1953, commercial and cultural relations were restored and the Jewish Agency opened a branch in Teheran.

The Shah declared at a press conference that his country recognised Israel. And so, a country said to be an Islamic member of the Baghdad Pact opened all opportunities of activity to Israel and helped it to work against the Arab homeland.

Actually Iran became in recent years a base for Israel threatening the Arab countries. In 1961 an Israeli paper called « Kol-Haam » reported the conclusion of a secret agreement between Iran and Israel and said that the agreement was signed at Teheran airport by Ben Gurion, who was on his way to Burma. That report was published on December 6, 1961.

After that, the Iranian press explained that engine trouble had forced Ben Gurion's plane to stop over at Teheran airport. Ali Aminy, the Iranian Prime Minister, was at the airport to greet Ben Gurion.

The papers went on to say that Ben Gurion's stop-over in Teheran was preplanned and that talks were held between Ben Gurion and the Prime Minister of Iran. The Chief of Staff of the Iranian Army — who represents Iran in CENTO — attended. The two sides studied the role of Israel in the defensive systems of the countries of CENTO. They also affirmed the importance of reinforcing the economic, political and military cooperation between the two countries.

Ali Aminy said during the talks that the departure from the principle of secrecy imposed on the agreement would cause harm to the relations between the countries of CENTO and Arab countries.

This was published in the Israeli paper « Kol-Haam » on December 6, 1961. This is the story of the Middle East Defence Organisation, the Baghdad Pact, the Eisenhower Doctrine, and CENTO. All were attempts, started before the Revolution and going on until now, to have the Arab countries join American and British pacts thus placing such countries within their zones of influence.

In the month of December last year there was a new stage. As the Middle East Defensive Pact developed into the Iraqi-Turkish agreement, into the Baghdad Pact, into the Eisenhower Doctrine and then into CENTO, so now comes the Islamic Pact.

Such talk about the Islamic Pact originally started in December 1965 in Britain, when on December 3, the British press said that King Feisal had sent his Moroccan friend, Mohamed El Kettany, on a secret mission to the Maghreb countries and that this mission was aimed at

establishing a sacred Islamic pact to confront progressive revolutions in the territory and to combat communism in the Arab world. They also said the idea was an attempt to find a suitable Islamic draft for the establishment of the pact. This took place on December 3, 1965.

On December 4, 1965, the French paper « La Tribune » said in its commentary that Washington had detailed King Feisal and the Shah of Iran to carry out the task of forming the Islamic Pact. It said that this sacred royal pact was of course an attempt to confront the Arab nationalism movement led by Cairo. The paper said that if Israel was invited to choose between the Kings' front and the liberated front, it would certainly choose the Kings' front.

On December 7, 1965, the French paper « Combat » said that King Feisal seized the present truce in the Yemen to lay the foundations for a Saudi-Iranian alliance in all fields and to set up a united Islamic front.

On December 30, 1965 a magazine called « Jeune Afrique », which is published in France, said in connection with the Saudi arms deal with Britain that this transaction had an association with King Feisal's visit to Iran and his call there for the establishment of an Islamic front.

This deal and this call, the magazine said, are in the main a revival of the Eisenhower Doctrine to fill the vacuum in the Middle East and a fulfilment of an old Anglo-American dream to establish a front to succeed the Baghdad Pact and CENTO, to stand in the face of Arab nationalism and neutralism which are sweeping the Middle East.

Britain would not have supplied King Feisal with arms if she had not obtained a promise from him that they would not be used against Israel and that they would be used for setting up an east of Suez defence force under the name of the Islamic Front. The magazine added: 'Washington only cares to keep oil far from every surprise'.

On January 13 this year, the French daily 'La Croix' said that the Saudi-Iranian understanding, supported by the British and Americans, strengthened the theory that Washington and London would help King Feisal and the Shah with an Islamic pact project against the expansion of socialism in the Middle East.

On the same day, the French newspaper 'La Tribune' said that the United States has started to depend on Saudi Arabia for mobilising the Arab world. It seems, the paper said, that there are wide-scale strategic intentions which may be interpreted in the light of supplying Iran and Saudi Arabia with weapons and changing the land tactics of the Baghdad Pact to air and sea tactics. The paper also said that the objective was to support the reactionary trends, reduce national economic demands and link the prosperity of these nations with foreign interests.

On January 18, 1966, the London « Daily Telegraph » said that King Feisal was leading a movement to revive the idea of the Islamic Pact. The paper said that so long as the Middle East remained a closed shop of Arab countries, Cairo would doubtlessly remain its political capital. But the presence of an Islamic pact, in which the repre-

sentatives of states like Turkey, Iran and Pakistan would take part, would change the situation. The paper said that various Moslem leaders held that the Islamic Pact could be more influential than Arab nationalism in international affairs.

Of course, more influential in being pro-Western since the Islamic Pact would be an advocate of the West. «The Times» said on February 15, 1966, that the idea of holding an Islamic conference was not new and that despite what was being said that the new conference would study social and economic issues, it was assumed that the objective of the conference was mainly political since it would be attended by several Arab countries which would decrease the weight of the liberated Arab countries.

On February 16, 1966, the French newspaper, «Le Monde Diplomatique» was wondering whether the slogan of Islam would manage to defeat the progressive forces of the Arab world.

Not one word of what I have just quoted is mine. I have put together some parts published in newspapers. Many of us read these newspapers every day, and we have followed what they said on the Islamic Pact which they later called an Islamic conference, then called an Islamic grouping, then called an Islamic summit meeting.

We did not express our views about it until I made the statement some days ago that we believe that this is a pact like the Baghdad Pact and that its destiny will be like that of the Baghdad Pact. I have made this historical review so that we can note, and so that the struggling Arab people of all Arab countries can note, that

we all have a continuous struggle before us. The day when the Baghdad Pact was established, Nuri El-Said thought that the Arab peoples would not struggle and would not fight against it. But the Arab peoples struggled and fought and toppled the Baghdad Pact.

I am also showing that the system used in the past is the same as that used today. The same method is in use: starting with a slogan, then proceeding from within; they follow a simple procedure, until they bind all of the Arab countries hand and foot and deliver them to Britain and America.

An example of what the Western policy in the Middle East calls for is this : Anthony Nutting, the former British Minister of State, made a tour in the Arab countries after the failure of the Suez campaign, then published a series of articles in the «New York Herald Tribune» in 1957. What did Nutting say ? He said that the only course for reaching an agreement with Arab nationalism should be through the establishment of an Islamic League of the area's Islamic Kingdoms. The Arab countries would thus emerge from the limited scope of Arab nationalism in which there is no room for understanding, to the wide scope of the Islamic creed, which embraces the Arabs, Turks, Iranians and Pakistanis in a wide area where their nationalities are forgotten and think only in terms of Islam. In this way the Arab countries could reach an agreement with the West. They could even reach an agreement with Israel in this way because while the Arabs do not accept Israel's existence amongst them, the Islamic countries could accept Israel.

He has based this of course, on the recognition of Israel by Iran and Turkey.

This was said in 1957 about the Islamic Pact, the Islamic League or the Islamic Grouping. I said last year that it was a year of hardship with regard to the struggle and a serious year for the Arab struggle. Signs of what I said began to appear. Imperialistic and reactionary countries began to believe that the progressive powers in the Arab world have weakened, that such powers were tired, and that there were disputes among progressive countries in the Arab world.

Imperialistic and reactionary countries believed that the progressive masses in the Arab world had become tired of the struggle, hence the door was opened for old and new colonialism to bring Arab countries into a new pact disguised behind religion. They found an Arab name for the Baghdad Pact. They made it put on Arab headwear and an Arab cloak in a bid to hide Britain and the USA. They made the new pact wear a turban. They called it the Islamic Pact, the Islamic Congress, or the Islamic Grouping. In other words, they tried to name it anything that is Islamic, any name over which they could place a turban.

They wanted to do so in order to deceive the Moslems and deceive the people in the name of religion. However, the goals are similar whether it is the Baghdad Pact or the Islamic Pact. The object is to destroy Arab nationalism which has dominated the thoughts and trends of the Arab peoples, taking into consideration the fact that Arab nationalism is the only way to get rid of imperialism and zones of influence and to realise Arab unity.

Such talk started in 1965 and this is what leads us to say that these will be the years when the Arab struggle will be at its height. The year 1965 has passed and the progressive forces are still holding out; the struggling Arab masses are still standing. The progressive forces and the struggling Arab masses may have not united sufficiently to completely overcome the alliance of imperialism and reaction. Last year, imperialism and reaction closed their ranks in spite of the contradictions existing between the various forms of reaction inside and outside the Arab world (for instance in Iran.)

Imperialism managed to move Bourguiba who attended the first Arab Summit Conference and adopted the Palestine cause and said he was ready to send the Tunisian army to stand on the borders of Palestine. Last year he called for the liquidation of the Palestine cause and called for negotiations with Israel and it was clear that by so doing he was representing the policy of imperialism and that he was but an actual agent of imperialism who was ready to sell out for any sum. The aim of Bourguiba's talk was to split the Arab front which appeared united and harmonious at the Arab summit meetings.

The first, second and third Arab summit meetings succeeded in getting us to lay down a unified plan for the sake of Palestine and to labour for strengthening Palestine's neighbouring countries and agree on unified action. There are contradictions, different contradictions with Arab reactions and yet we succeeded in bringing about unity of action for the sake of Palestine, and this was a big success.

We have also managed to set up the Unified Arab Command. The establishment of the Unified Arab Command was a great event in the history of the struggle of the Arab nation. We also managed through the Summit Conference to assemble the Palestine people for the first time since 1948.

Thus emerged the Palestine entity and the Palestine Liberation Organisation. Did this please imperialism?

We have said before that imperialism and Israel do not accept Arab unity, or rather, do not accept unity of ranks. The unity of Arab action for Palestine cannot be acceptable to Zionism. Then one person will go out to disintegrate the Arab front, and later they search for someone else to emerge to disrupt the Arab front.

Of course, the forces of reaction cooperate with imperialism, and they fear the Arab revolutionary tidal wave, which represents an ever-increasing danger to their interests. Imperialism feels that the Arab revolutionary tide represents an ever-increasing danger to the oil monopolies. The forces of reaction feel that the socialist stream threatens their position and existence.

This means that reaction is allying itself with imperialism for a new idea, namely, using religion as a tool with which it can restore its influence and keep on robbing the people of the fruit of their labour. This idea will continue to maintain for it its oil monopolies, out of which it reaps great benefits. It also guarantees that imperialism will restore its influence in the Arab countries and in this way it can get rid of the liberation movements in the Arab world.

Some people may ask what is the harm of the Islamic Pact and why do we refuse Islamic cooperation?

We never refused Islamic cooperation, but such co-operation must be for the sake of God and Islam and not be the outcome of American and British policy.

The Islamic Pact is an imperialist pact meant to fight liberation movements and oppose social progress. The Islamic Pact is an alliance for conspiring against Arab peoples and dragging them into Western zones of influence. It also conspires against other Islamic countries adopting the non-aligned policy.

The Islamic Pact is a grouping of all the reactionary tide in the Arab countries.

But why do we accuse the Islamic Pact of being reactionary and of cooperating with imperialism against Arabism, the Moslems and Palestine?

The answer is supplied by the original sponsors of this call in their papers in London and Washington. I have read to you what those people said in London. They said that the Pact is political and cannot be social, that Eisenhower told King Saud in 1957 of the idea of an Islamic Pact and that Saud came to Cairo to discuss this issue.

The countries which propagate the idea of an Islamic Pact or an Islamic Conference are Jeddah and Teheran. The presence of Teheran emphasises, and adds to the emphasis, that the Pact is against the Arabs and the Moslems and for the protection of reaction. Who supported the Pact in the Arab world, apart from Iran and

Saudi Arabia ? The papers of Bourguiba in Tunis supported the Pact, the enemies of Arabism and Islam in Lebanon supported the Pact, the people who hailed the Baghdad Pact in 1955. The papers which propagated the Baghdad Pact in 1955 and 1956 are the same which today propagate the Islamic Pact. The people who have always been known as the staunch enemies of Islam in Lebanon have become today the strongest supporters of the Islamic Pact and the Islamic Conference.

Who are the architects of the Pact ? Washington and London. They say the Pact can win us support for Palestine, but the same thing was said by Nuri El Said in 1955.

King Feisal says that the purpose of the Pact is to fight atheism, but do we fight atheism by politics or by religion ? This is a political pact and not a religious alliance or grouping. If it were a religious grouping, it would have been made by the men of religion. Is it the Shah of Iran and Bourguiba who will be the opponents of atheism in the Arab and Islamic world ? ! Why the Shah of Iran ? What does he know about Islam ? And since when did Bourguiba defend Islam ? Even the holiday of the last Bairam was reduced by him to just one day.

What gains can Palestine have from a pact supervised by the USA or Britain, a pact in which the rulers of Iran and Tunisia — who called for peace with Israel — participate ? The same words about Palestine were said by Nuri El Said in 1954 and 1955. The words about arms were also said by Nuri El Said in 1954 and 1955.

Someone may ask me about what I wrote in the book entitled «The Philosophy of the Revolution» with regard to the third sphere, the Islamic sphere. We said we had three spheres, the Arab, the African and the Islamic spheres.

In «The Philosophy of the Revolution» we talked about every sphere in detail. Speaking about the third sphere in «The Philosophy of the Revolution», we said it was the sphere extending across continents and oceans. I said it was the sphere of brothers in creed who face one direction in praying wherever they may be under the sun ; brothers whose lips repeat the same prayers wherever they exist under the sun. I said we should change our attitude towards pilgrimage, that pilgrimage should become a great political power, and that pilgrimage should become a political conference. I called for regular meetings among leaders of Islamic countries during pilgrimage. I called for such leaders to meet, weak before Almighty God but strong before their problems and enemies, dreaming of another life, and with strong faith in their particular place under the sun which they should occupy.

We advocated this idea, but on a political basis, in 1953 and pursued this line after 1953. But we did not complete this political conference because when the Baghdad Pact was formed early in 1955 it became impossible for the Islamic conference to be convened as a political conference not linked with imperialism, working in the interest of Islam and Moslems, to get rid of imperialism and pacts, for the establishment of social justice

and for giving justice to the Moslems in every Moslem country.

After the creation of the Baghdad Pact and the joining of Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and Iraq, it became difficult for the Islamic conference to meet on a political basis. We, therefore, pursued the idea on a popular level. We felt that any Islamic *rapprochement* on summit level must begin with those who succeeded in liberating their countries from imperialism, pacts and spheres of influence. Contacts between these were continuous.

If the call for Islamic *rapprochement* were not on this basis, then its purpose would be despite the slogan of Islam, to strike at the Moslems in the name of religion, the separation of the Moslems and of the Arabs in the interest of imperialism. In other words, it would be a forgery of religion to serve the principles and objectives of imperialism.

During the last Summit conference, we discussed Islamic cooperation but we did not take any decision in this connection. We did not take any decision on Islamic solidarity as they are claiming now. We said that each of us would do his best to encourage Islamic countries to proceed with us for the issues of liberty and Palestine. King Feisal said yesterday in his statement to the paper of Kuwait, that cooperation had sprung up between the Christian communities, that a meeting of the Ecumenical Council was held for this purpose, and that this meeting was not interpreted as being a new alliance.

Of course, this statement contains an evident misrepresentation, since the meeting of the Ecumenical Coun-

cil was neither political nor military. The meeting of the Ecumenical Council included the Christian men of religion, not the Christian Heads of State. If it had contained the heads of Christian countries, it would have been immediately turned into a political meeting, a political conference.

Our position here in the United Arab Republic, our attitude towards the new moves, is that we oppose all shady imperialist and reactionary moves. We oppose the use of religion and the name of religion for the realisation of the objectives of imperialism and reaction.

We oppose the falsification of religion. We oppose the exploitation of the sacred principles by reaction and imperialism. We oppose the Islamic Pact and the Islamic conference as we earlier opposed the Baghdad Pact, the Eisenhower Doctrine and all reactionary, suspicious and imperialist movements that took place in this territory since the beginning of the Revolution up till now.

We say that this Islamic solidarity is the solidarity between reactionary governments which are imperialist agents exploiting and falsifying Islam ; reactionary governments that want to stop the march of history and the march of progress. We say that the struggling Arab masses which struggled in 1955 as well as in 1956 and 1958 and later in 1962 are the same masses existing today and are capable of struggle.

But they have to unite their struggle. They can struggle and can confront this new imperialist alliance as they confronted the Baghdad Pact. They can bring about the downfall of this imperialist pact as they brought

about the downfall of the Baghdad Pact. They can reveal everything to the public. They can distinguish between the struggling forces and the forces of reaction ; between those who work for the interest of the masses and those who exploit them. The Arab masses are capable of classifying people. They can know who are reactionary, who are socialist and who are falsifying and exploiting religion.

The struggling peoples are well aware that the unity of the Arab struggle in all the Arab countries can put an end to the strongest plot.

This unity foiled the 1956 tripartite aggression. We paid the price. People died ; many were killed in battle. We paid the price again after the unity and after the secession and up till now.

The Arab struggling people are prepared to continue their struggle. They know that reaction, which for long exploited people and kept them in backwardness, can only defend its entity against socialism, the call for equality of opportunity and progress by falsifying religion as its only defence line.

But the Arab masses will soon discover the use of religion as a tool to drag Arab countries into the zones of influence. They will bring about the downfall of the Islamic Pact as they previously did with the Baghdad Pact.

May God be with you.

The National Publication House